

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that that claims 1-4, 8-10 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the U.S. patent to Yi in view of the U.S. patent to Kirby.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds for the rejection of the claims over the art, applicants amended claim 1, the broadest claim on file, and also added claim 17 which is second independent claim.

It is respectfully submitted that the new features of the present invention which are now defined in claims 1 and 17 are not disclosed in the references.

In the Examiner's rejection of the claims, the Examiner indicated that the patent to Yi did not disclose two cells with different quantities of the catalytic coatings, while however the patent to Kirby disclosed that the anode catalyst layer and the cathode catalyst layer have different quantities of the catalyst, and therefore the quantity of the

catalyst of the anode of one cell is different from the quantity of the catalyst of the anode of the other cell.

While the Examiner's above mentioned statement is completely correct, the references still did not disclose the new features of the present invention.

Claim 1 as amended defines that the quantity of the coatings of one of the cells is different from the quantity of the coatings of the other cell. The term "coatings" clearly means that in the first cell there are coatings of the anode and of the cathode, and the second cell there are coatings of the anode and of the cathode, and in the quantities of the coatings of the anode and cathode of one cell are different from the quantities of the anode and cathode of the other cell, correspondingly.

This has nothing to do with two cells in which the quantity of the catalytic coating of the anode is different from the quantity of the catalytic coating of the cathode in two different cells.

Claim 17 even further clarifies the invention by saying that the quantities of the catalytic coatings of one cell and the quantities of the catalytic coatings of the other cell are adapted to different loads or operational conditions, so that when one fuel cell operates relatively

frequently it has a greater quantity of the catalytic coatings, while the other of the cells which operates relatively seldom has a smaller quantity of the catalytic coatings.

It is believed to be clear that the adaptation is not performed by providing the difference in the catalytic coatings of the anode of one cell and of the cathode of the other cell, but instead the quantities of the catalytic coatings of the anode and cathode of one cell are different from the quantities of the catalytic coatings of the anode and cathode of the other cell.

It is therefore believed to be clear that the new features of the present invention which are now defined in claims 1 and 17 clearly and patentably distinguish the present invention from the prior art applied by the Examiner and represented by the patents to Yi and Kirby whose teachings are combined with one another.

Claims 1 and 17 should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

As for the dependent claims, these claims depend on claim 1, they share its allowable feature, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that they should be allowed as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance; he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27233